

Message

From: Pelton, Jason M (DEC) [jason.pelton@dec.ny.gov]
Sent: 3/16/2017 5:57:33 PM
To: Garbarini, Doug [Garbarini.Doug@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Quarterly Meeting Question

Doug:

Not that I am aware of. I can look into the follow-up conversation with the Navy though.

Thanks
Jason

From: Garbarini, Doug [mailto:Garbarini.Doug@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 1:53 PM
To: Pelton, Jason M (DEC) <jason.pelton@dec.ny.gov>
Subject: RE: Quarterly Meeting Question

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Hi Jason

Seems like we had the same understanding. I was not, at least initially, whether Martin and Catherine realized there was likely to be another piece to this for the downgradient portion of the plume, but I think they ultimately understood that.

You may have noticed that I interrupted Lora when she indicated they would seek to capture the 1ppm portion of the plume; she did then say that they agreed that to the extent practicable (or some analogous term) they were still planning on going after the 500 ppb; however if it takes them 4 years to get the wells in, the plume may move beyond the locations they are currently considering for the additional well(s). I believe Stan Carey brought this up at the meeting. Getting the 500 ppb is very important to the WDs, though if the "Saladino" study results in plume containment that may change their perspective.

So, I guess you guys have not had the follow up conversation with the Navy yet? Catherine had asked us (EPA team) to see if we could participate in that call when it happens. I had mentioned this to Bob week before last, and I believe he put in an email (or other inquiry) to Martin about it...but I have not heard back.

Fine for us to review the draft minutes once Don gets through them.

Thanks

Doug

From: Pelton, Jason M (DEC) [mailto:jason.pelton@dec.ny.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 12:05 PM
To: Garbarini, Doug <Garbarini.Doug@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Quarterly Meeting Question

Doug:

Thanks. That is what I was thinking, but when I look at my notes I start second guessing myself!

I do know that RE-137 is the test well located adjacent to Hicksville Road and immediately north of Hempstead Turnpike. The Navy will be completing aquifer pumping tests in the near future on this well to assess pumping rates and capture zones for the RE-108 treatment system. This well could ultimately be converted to an actual groundwater extraction well for the RE-108 hotspot area. The exact location for a treatment system for the RE-108 area has yet to be defined.

The Interim Hotspot Conveyance System that Martin discussed with the Navy about a week before the quarterly meeting and that the Navy introduced at the quarterly meeting would involve installation of a recovery well also adjacent to Hicksville Road, but in the area where the east-west trending utility corridor passes through this area. The transmission lines for this well would be installed in the utility corridor and convey water to the GM-38 system for treatment.

On a separate, but related note, we should plan on talking in the near future about GM-38. Over the next several months the Navy will be evaluating this system to determine if the system can be taken off-line or if the flow rate can be reduced. You are correct that GM-38 now includes extraction from a single pumping well (RW-01). Operation of RW-03 ended in July 2015. The RW-01 pumping rate was increased to a total average pumping rate of approximately 1,000 gpm when RW-03 was taken off-line.

For the comparison though, I will confirm with Martin, but I agree with you that it was the intent to compare the concepts of the Interim Hotspot Conveyance System utilizing GM-38 to an option that would involve utilizing BWD Plant 6.

One last thing. I have prepared the draft minutes and Don is currently reviewing them. If you are okay with it, I will forward them to you after his review and maybe we can discuss during a subsequent conference call?

Thanks,

Jason

From: Garbarini, Doug [<mailto:Garbarini.Doug@epa.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 11:33 AM

To: Pelton, Jason M (DEC) <jason.pelton@dec.ny.gov>

Subject: RE: Quarterly Meeting Question

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Hi Jason

I agree that the conversation was a bit confusing.

The way I understand the situation is as follows:

- The Navy had proposed using Plant 6 as part of the capture/treatment system for hotspot RE-108; the system would be complemented by one or two additional extraction wells that would target the portion of the plume downgradient of the Plant 6 capture zone with the objective of capturing the 500 ppb portion of the plume (it took a lot of effort to get the Navy to agree to chase after this; they had been reluctant to capture anything lower than 1000 ppb). An additional treatment system might be needed for these other wells (i.e., Plant 6 might not be used for these)
- A week or so before the meeting, the Navy suggested to Martin that an extraction well (was it 137?) was being installed and that they planned to send that over to the GM-38 treatment system for treatment rather than use Plant 6 wells and treatment system. My impression was that their proposal still included the one or two additional wells for the further downgradient portion of the plume. Note that EPA had previously (maybe 2 years ago) raised concerns about the Navy shutting down one of the two extraction wells going to the GM-38 system as the concentrations in the influent were still relatively high. While it might make sense to send more

contaminated stuff there (from well 137), we should probably consider whether it is appropriate to stop pumping one or both of the existing extraction wells; it sounds as if one of the wells has been shut down.

Based upon the above, I thought I heard Catherine and Martin asking the Navy to provide info on costs and time to implement the portion of the remedy that dealt with the existing plume 6 capture vs. the 137 capture with transmission and treatment at GM-38 (i.e., not the portion associated with the one or two additional extraction wells, that were to supplement Plant 6 capture, and associated treatment). It seemed as though it would cost about \$5M to acquire and upgrade Plant 6, vs. using around \$1-2M for a transmission line (and other costs) from well 137 to GM-38.

Martin had indicated that you were to have a follow up call with the Navy to discuss their proposal. Did that call happen and if it did could you let me know what was covered?

Thanks and give a call if you want to discuss. 212-637-4288 my take on the discussion we had at the quarterly meeting.

Doug

From: Pelton, Jason M (DEC) [<mailto:jason.pelton@dec.ny.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 8:19 AM
To: Garbarini, Doug <Garbarini.Doug@epa.gov>
Subject: Quarterly Meeting Question

Doug:

I was trying to recall the overall scope of the request for the U.S. Navy to prepare a comparison of the RE-108 treatment and disposal option and was hoping you may be able to help me.

As you know, Catherine suggested that the Navy complete a simple comparison of the RE-108 options to evaluate overall effectiveness, cost, and timeframe.

Do you recall if this was a comparison between a new RE-108 plant and the use of the BWD Plant 6 and/or was it for the use of GM-38 as part of the Interim Hotspot Conveyance System?

Thanks and call me if this is easier to discuss.

Jason

Jason Pelton


Project Manager, Division of Environmental Remediation

Remedial Bureau D, Section B

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

625 Broadway, Albany, NY 12233

P: (518) 402-9478 | F: (518) 402-9773 | jason.pelton@dec.ny.gov

www.dec.ny.gov |  | 